2120
.2

PROPERTY OF THE
2120 . 2
Public Library of the City of Boston
SICUT PATRIBUS SIT DEUS NOBIS
BOSTONIA
CONDITA AD.
1630.
SUB REGIMINE DOMINI A.M. 1828.
From the Phillips Fund.
Added December 8. 1856. No. 14135.

ROYAL SOCIETY OF

PRINTING,

A

MEMOIR OF THE ORIGIN OF.

BY RALPH WILLETT.

ANTIQUARIES, LONDON.

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

PUBLIC LIBRARY
CITY OF BOSTON
OCT 1918

16136

XXII. *Memoir on the Origin of Printing. Addreſſed to* John Topham, *Eſq. F. R. and A. SS. By* Ralph Willett, *Eſq. F. R. and A. SS.*

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

DEAR SIR,

YOUR favourable, though perhaps partial, opinion of the following Memoir on the ſubject of the origin of printing, as alſo that of another able and reſpectable friend belonging to our Society, incline me to hope for the indulgence of it in preſenting it to their peruſal.

After what had been written by Dr. Middleton and Dr. Ducarel concerning the Lambeth MSS. I little expected the ſubject would have been revived by ſuch reſpectable writers as Mr. Meerman, and Meſſrs. Bowyer and Nichols: the latter, indeed, little more than tranſcribe, for I can hardly call it copy, the ſentiments of the former; however, as they poſſeſs a conſiderable rank in literature, and explain and ſtrengthen, as far as they are able, the arguments of the other writer, they are well entitled to the obſervations I ſhall attempt to make on what they have written.

I do this the more willingly, as I believe their little tract is the only one that hath been written in the Engliſh language ſince the time of Palmer. The ſize of their book, as well as their reputation, hath induced the generality of Engliſh readers to reſt ſatisfied with what they have ſaid on a ſubject they perhaps do not feel themſelves deeply intereſted in. It would have been fairer to have ſtated the arguments uſed in the con-

futation of thoſe urged by the writers for Harlem, as well as thoſe that *ſeem* to make for their advantage.

This hath been done, with honour to himſelf, by Meerman; if the reader makes a falſe judgement on the reſult, he is only to blame himſelf: Meerman hath furniſhed him with the means of making a right one, though prejudice, in favour of his own country, hath prevented him from doing it for himſelf.

Though it may not be neceſſary to repeat all that Middleton hath urged, it may be ſo in regard to the obſervations of Ducarel; ſome of them are new, and could not occur to Middleton, as he wrote ſome time before the appearance of Ducarel's letter to Meerman [*a*]. If I am able to add any thing of my own, I ſhall think myſelf happy. As I am convinced myſelf, that this pretented MS. at Lambeth hath miſled both Meerman and Bowyer, as they ſeem to rely very much on it to ſupport the claims of Harlem; in endeavouring to complete the deſtruction of all credit to it, I ſhall weaken the fabrick, by withdrawing the corner-ſtone from it.

Here follows the ſuppoſed Lambeth Record, as given by Maittaire, from Atkins's book.

" The original and growth of printing, collected out of *hiſtory*, and the records of this *kingdom*, wherein it is alſo demonſtrated, that printing appertaineth to the *prerogative royal*, and is a flower of England; by Richard Atkins, Eſq. Whitehall, April 25, 1664. By order and appointment of the Right Hon. Mr. Secretary Morrice.

" Thomas Bourchier, archbiſhop of Canterbury, moved the then king, (Henry the Sixth,) to uſe all poſſible means for procuring a printing *mold* (for ſo it was called then) to be brought into this kingdom. The king (a good man, and

[*a*] Firſt printed in Mr. Nichols's Supplement to the Origin of Printing, 1781.

much

much given to works of this nature) readily hearkened to the motion; and, taking private advice how to effect his deſign, concluded it could not be brought about without great ſecrecy, and a conſiderable ſum of money given to ſuch perſon or perſons as would draw off the workmen from *Harlem*, in *Holland*, where *John Guttenberg* had newly *invented* it, and was himſelf *perſonally* at work. It was reſolved that leſs than 1000 marks would not produce the deſired effect, towards which ſum the ſaid *archbiſhop* preſented the king 300 marks. The money being now prepared, the management of the deſign was committed to Mr. Robert Tournour, who then was of the robes to the king, and a perſon moſt in favour with him of any of his condition. Mr. Tournour took to his aſſiſtance Mr. Caxton, a citizen of good abilities, who, trading much into *Holland*, might be a creditable pretence as well for his going as ſtay in the Low Countries. Mr. Tournour was in diſguiſe, his beard and hair ſhaven quite off; but Mr. Caxton appeared known and public; *they* having received the ſaid ſum of 1000 marks, went firſt to Amſterdam, then to Leyden, not daring to enter Harlem itſelf; for the town was very jealous, having impriſoned and apprehended divers perſons, who came from other parts for the ſame purpoſe. They ſtaid till they had ſpent the whole 1000 marks in gifts and expences, ſo as the king was obliged to ſend 500 marks more, Mr. Tournour having written to the king that he had almoſt done his work; a bargain, as he ſaid, betwixt him and two Hollanders, for bringing off one of the workmen, who ſhould ſufficiently diſcover and teach this new art. At laſt, with much-a-do, they got off one of the *underworkmen*, whoſe name was Frederick Corſellis, or Courſellis, who late one night ſtole from his fellows in diſguiſe into a veſſel prepared before for that purpoſe, and ſo, the wind favouring the ſhip, brought

brought him ſafe to London. It was not thought ſo prudent to ſet him on work at London; but, by the archbiſhop's means, who had been vice-chancellor of the Univerſity of Oxon, Corſellis was carried with a guard to Oxford, which guard conſtantly watched to prevent Corſellis from any poſſible eſcape, till he had made good his promiſe in teaching how to print; ſo that, at Oxford, printing was firſt ſet up in England before there was any printing-preſs in France, Italy, or Germany, except the city of *Mentz*, which claims ſeniority of printing, even of Harlem itſelf, calling her city *Urbem Moguntinam, Artis Typographicæ inventricem primam*, though 'tis known to be otherwiſe, that city gaining that art by the brother of one of the workmen of Harlem, who had learnt it *at home* of *his brother*, and after ſet up for himſelf at Mentz."

It is ſaid, though the record doth not ſtate it, that this journey of Caxton and Tournour was performed in the year 1459: probably it was not ſooner; for the invention of the art was not known even in France, though ſo much nearer to Mentz, till the reign of Charles the Eighth, or the beginning of that of Louis the Eleventh, as appears from the authorities quoted by Salier, vol. XIV. p. 229, Acad. des Inſcriptions, and mentioned by me in a former memoir preſented by me to the Society.

Communications between the ſeveral countries of Europe were, in that early period, few and ſlow; knowledge was confined to the confeſſedly learned; and journeymen ſhoemakers, &c. had not been taught to thunder out Philippicks that rival Demoſthenes; the knowledge of this great invention, the diſcovery of printing, therefore, could not reach England ſooner, if ſo ſoon, as 1459.

Now it may be obſerved that Caxton was not in England in 1459. Bowyer himſelf, p. 11, allows that he was out of England

England from 1441 to 1471; a conſiderable part of which time he was buſied in learning the art of printing, as he ſays himſelf; he muſt, therefore, have been in the neighbourhood of Harlem, (for it was in the Netherlands that he reſided,) at the very time in which the art is ſaid to be invented there; and yet, though very expreſs in relating the invention of it at Mentz, he ſays not a word of its *prior* diſcovery, though very important, at Harlem.

To anſwer this difficulty, Meerman ſays, that this ſilence of Caxton is not to be wondered at in relation to his journey to Harlem, any more than his ſilence with regard to his own introduction of the art into England. What relation have thoſe two caſes to each other? Caxton's Polychronicon ends in 1460; the introduction of the art into England by him (if he did introduce it, which I doubt) was not till about 1474. To give ſtrength to this anſwer, the Polychronicon ſhould have come down to that year at leaſt, before the two caſes could influence each other [*b*].

But the point now conteſted is not whether Caxton introduced the art into England; it may be allowed to Bowyer that he did not, and yet the ſuſpicion, of the Lambeth MS. being a forgery, be no way leſſened by it.

I confeſs, with reſpect to myſelf, I do not believe that Caxton did introduce it, and am inclined to think that the letter ſigned Oxonides, though very ſevere on the Lambeth MS. in calling it an *idle* ſtory, contains the moſt probable account of its introduction; it may, therefore, be proper, if I do not too much treſpaſs on the patience of the Society, to give as much of it as relates to this point; it appeared, as Mr. Bowyer ſays, in the Weekly Miſcellany, April, 26, 1735, ſoon after Dr. Middleton had publiſhed his litttle tract [*c*].

[*b*] Bowyer, p.9. [*c*] Ibid. p. 24

I think

I think the learned author has ſufficiently expoſed the *idle* ſtory of Frederick Corſellis, and entirely concur with *him in rejecting* it; but when he compliments Caxton with the name of our firſt printer, notwithſtanding the authority of a book printed at Oxford, and dated in the year 1468, I cannot go ſo far with him. We ſhould not pretend to ſet aſide the authority of a *plain date*, without very ſtrong and cogent reaſons; and I am afraid what the Doctor has in this caſe advanced will not appear, on examination, to carry that weight with it that he ſeems to imagine. There may be, and have been, miſtakes and forgeries in the date both of books and records too; but this is never allowed as a reaſon for ſuſpecting ſuch as bear no mark of either; we cannot, from a blunder in the laſt book printed at Cambridge, infer the like blunder in the firſt book printed at Oxford; beſides, the type uſed in this our Oxford edition ſeems to be no ſmall proof of its antiquity; it is the German letter, and very nearly the ſame with that uſed by Fuſt, (who has been ſuppoſed) the firſt printer; whereas Caxton and Rood uſe a quite different letter, ſomething between this German and our old Engliſh letter, which was ſoon after introduced by De Worde and Pynſon; laſtly, the ſuppoſed year of this edition is much about the time that the printers at Mentz diſperſed and carried the art of printing with them to moſt parts of Europe. This circumſtance joined to that of the letter, inclines me to think that *one of theſe printers might then come over to England, and follow his profeſſion at Oxford.*

Although very unwilling to take any merit from our own country, I muſt not ſuffer that partiality which I condemn in Meerman to miſlead me; I muſt therefore give up the pretenſions of Caxton, who never printed before 1474, and concur with Oxonides, as there are too many proofs of this early diſperſion

diſperſion of the printers to be withſtood; the Lactantius printed in 1465 at Subiaco; the St. Auſtin, printed in the ſame monaſtery, near Rome, probably by Sweynheim, in 1467; another tract of St. Auſtin, at Cologne, in 1467, by Zell; another book in 1468, at Tours, in France; the Bible by Bemler at Augſbourg, in 1466; and many by Spire, at Venice, in 1469; ſeveral by Sweynheim, at Rome, in 1468; are ſuch teſtimonies of this early diſperſion as render it not improbable that ſome of them might attempt a ſettlement in England, at a time when ſuch a munificent prince as Edward the fourth filled the throne, and the nation was in perfect tranquillity; ſome of theſe migrations were probably even earlier; for, beſides the ſtrong reaſons for ſuppoſing a preſs at Harlem in 1459, Mr. Meerman [*c*] allows of one at Franckfort in 1459, by a workman of Fuſt; he ſays, *Joannes Peterſheim*, miniſter Fuſti & Schoefferi, *erexit Francofurti officinam typographicam*, 1459.

But the ſilence of Caxton himſelf in his numerous and diffuſed Colophons (for he ſeems to be a loquacious though modeſt writer in whatever concerns himſelf) is a conſiderable argument that he did not claim the honour of this introduction of the art into England. Fabian, who was a cotemporary with Caxton, and mentions expreſsly the invention at Mentz; as likewiſe Aldridge, from Anſtis's Black book of the Garter, though he ſpeaks in the ſame manner with relation to the ſame city, ſays not a word of Caxton's bringing the art to Engiand. Why then ſhould we be wiſer at this remote period of time in giving this honour to Caxton, when it doth not appear that he ever claimed it himſelf? Ducarel adduces a new and ſtrong proof againſt this MS; he ſays, that in Archbiſhop Parker's Antiquities of the Britiſh Church,

[*c*] Page 34.

there is this MS note, written, probably, by the archbiſhop himſelf, concerning Bourchier.

" His temporibus (viz. Tho. Bourchieri) illa utiliſſima cudendi atque imprimendi libros ſcientia, Argentorati, Germaniæ civitate, inventa eſt; etſi de authoris, loci, annique, certa veritate, inter ſcriptores magna diſſentio eſt, quam perpendant lectores [*d*]."

If Bourchier had taken ſuch a great part in the introduction of the art into England, was it not natural that the archbiſhop ſhould obſerve it in this note? If the MS. was known to him, would he not have uſed it to give credit, not only to Bourchier, but to the ſee itſelf over which he preſided? It muſt have been at Lambeth at this time, viz. 1572, for it was there, according to Atkins, ſo late as 1664 [*e*].

But, farther, Godwin de Præſulibus Angliæ [*f*], ſays, that Bourchier did nothing remarkable during ſuch a long period as thirty-two years that he filled the See of Canterbury, except giving 120l. as a fund for ſupplying the wants of poor *ſcholars* occaſionally, and leaving 100 books to the Univerſity. There are two regiſters of Bourchier's tranſactions during this period at Lambeth, which Godwyn examined carefully; ſurely if the archbiſhop had been ſo inſtrumental in bringing over the art to England, he could not be ſaid to have done nothing remarkable, eſpecially as it appears he was in ſome degree a lover of learning, by leaving that fund and thoſe books for promoting it; ſome mention of this extraordinary part of his life muſt have occurred; and yet, none is found in the regiſters.

In 1642 Ducarel ſtates that the great queſtion, between the king's prerogative of licenſing books and the Stationers

[*d*] Ducarel, p. 188. [*e*] Bowyer, p. 18.
[*f*] Edid. Richardſon, p. 129.

com-

company, took place; Prynne, at that time a member of parliament, was one of thoſe who were employed to inveſtigate and report to the houſe the reſult of their inquiry. Prynne, after mentioning his authorities, proceeds to ſay; "Ex his teſtimoniis colligo artem impreſſoriam inventam fuiſſe in Germania circa annum 1440, publicatam et exercitam circa annum 1450." If this treaſure had been known, Prynne could not have been ignorant of it; it muſt have been brought forward on this occaſion, for it was then at Lambeth; in 1665 Sir John Birkenhead had a copy of it; but, not ſatisfied with that, he inſpected the original, then in the cuſtody of archbiſhop Sheldon, but, not finding it ſufficient to *prove what Atkins had cited it for, made no report of the MS. to the houſe.* Theſe are Bowyer's own words, p. 18.

What could he cite it for, but to prove the king's prerogative, from a king's introduction of the art at his own expence? If the ſtory of Caxton and Tournour's journey was true, the MS. muſt have mentioned it, and ſo have eſtabliſhed the prerogative: if no ſuch account appeared in it, Atkins was guilty of the moſt impudent and unprofitable forgery ever known, except Lauder's and Rowley's in our own times; and the MS. can have no weight in this enquiry; but, perhaps, he did not expect that his book would have had ſuch a ſerious enquiry into it.

If he had not depended on a more implicit belief, he ſhould have mentioned who the honourable perſon was that ſupplied him with the account of the MS; he muſt know that he was to contradict the univerſally-received opinion at that time that Caxton brought it into England; it became therefore neceſſary to give all the weight he could to this *new* account of its introduction; the honourable perſon could not be

hurt by the mention of his name, and the MS. would certainly have been benefited by this reference to another authority.

With reſpect to the ſignatures, which Middleton gives, perhaps, too much importance to, I muſt allow that they are a fallacious guide; for, though Zarot is ſaid to be the firſt inventor of them in his Terence at Milan in 1470, he certainly did not continue to uſe them; for, in his beautiful edition of Horace at that place in 1474, there are *no ſignatures,* nor are they in the Hiſtoriæ Auguſtæ Scriptores by *Lavagnia* in 1475, at the ſame place. Whenever they might be invented, they were ſlowly adopted, for I have no book with them ſooner than Juniani Maii de proprietate verborum priſcorum, printed at Naples by Moravus in 1475. Jenſon's Bible at Venice in 1476, hath them for the firſt time; and ſeveral others about that time employed them; but, that Zarot did not invent them for the firſt time in 1470 is proved by the Oxford book in 1468, which hath them. They were late in making their way into England. Caxton in his Dictes and Sayings of the Philoſophers in 1477 hath them not; but they appear in his Myrrour of the World in 1480; and ſeem to have been employed always afterwards by him. I have four ancient Miſſals, in which there are no ſignatures, and I am pretty certain there are none in the celebrated one belonging to the late Dutcheſs of Portland. There are none in the Speculum, either the Latin or Belgic edition; and, though they are found in the Biblia Pauperum, they ſeem to have been put there only to direct the arrangement of the *prints;* as they are placed only in an obſcure part of them. I certainly have not ſeen ſo great a number of Miſſals and MSS. as theſe gentlemen have had opportunities of doing; their account may therefore be right: I chuſe to confine myſelf to ſuch as I have really ſeen *myſelf,* in which I find no ſignatures; but I muſt

muſt allow the uſe or omiſſion are not concluſive, although *De Laar,* and other eminent Bibliographers, lay great ſtreſs on them for aſcertaining books without dates or printers names.

But, before I quit this unfortunate ſucceſs of the MS. in proving any judicial enquiry, I muſt obſerve, that, in three years after this miſcarriage in Prynne's affair, a ſuit was inſtituted in the King's Bench, by the Company of Stationers, againſt the Univerſity of Cambridge, for printing books; the Lambeth MS. was again brought forward by the former; but rejected by the bench, who would not ſuffer it to be urged, as it reſted *only on the credit of Mr. Atkins*; what was become of the MS. itſelf, as this ſeems to imply that only Atkin's account of it was offered, and that doubted?

But the ſtrongeſt objection to this book being printed by Corſellis is, that it is ſaid to be printed on wooden types or blocks, the only mode, he ſays, then uſed at Harlem. If he reſts his faith on this foundation, he ſhould have taken care to ſee the book. Mr. Herbert, who hath continued Ames's Typographical Antiquities, not only ſaw it, but examined it carefully, and hath given a fac ſimile of the Colophon, declares not only on his own authority, but that of the moſt eminent printers to whom he ſhewed it, that it is printed with the *fuſile ſeparate metal* type, and not on wooden blocks; and if we may rely on the fac ſimile exhibited by him, we may ſafely add that it is performed with as beautiful a type as any we know from the moſt celebrated printer of that age. But, now the wooden types are mentioned, may I be allowed to ſay, with Heinecken, that the time may come, when the writers on this ſubject will be aſhamed to inſiſt on them? there is no mention of them in Schoeffer's account to Trithemius. *He* only talks of wooden blocks. *Wooden* types muſt be too weak, under any management, to bear the preſs, and muſt be ſoon broken; they could

could not bear waſhing and cleaning, they muſt *ſwell* with the moiſture, and *ſhrink* in drying, and ſo never preſerve their true ſhape and form for any time. We know, indeed, that they were attempted, but ſoon abandoned; and no *entire* book was, probably, ever printed with them. The notion of the *Fuſo-ſculpti*, ſo eagerly taken up by Meerman, ſeems to me to be ſtill more abſurd; and I am ſurprized that Bowyer and Nichols, eminent printers themſelves, and therefore competent to have corrected Meerman in ſuch an extravagant idea, ſhould countenance and ſupport him in it; I will venture to pronounce it *impoſſible*.

The Lambeth MS. is certainly of conſequence to Meerman; for, ſlender as the authority is, it is the only one from which we can infer there were two Guttenbergs, printers; an advantage he makes uſe of. But how is it to be inferred? Caxton and Tournour were ſent to Harlem, where *John Guttenberg* had newly invented the art, and was himſelf perſonally at work. The MS. proceeds to ſay, Mentz gained the art by the *brother* of one of the *workmen* of Harlem, who had learnt it at home of his *brother*, and afterwards ſet up for himſelf at Mentz; a pretty foundation to build two Guttenbergs upon, ſen^{r} and jun^{r}. This ſtatement is rather perplexed. But there ſhould be three Guttenbergs; for *John Guttenberg* had then *newly invented* the art *as maſter*, which, it ſeems, one of his *workmen* knew before himſelf. It ſhould be noted that poor Coſter comes in for no ſhare of the honour, though it was at Harlem he had theſe correſpondences with the woodland nymphs of the groves about that place, not twenty-five years before. It is not even ſaid this workman was *brother* to John Guttenberg, or that his name was the ſame, though it would have given ſome weight to the account. Caxton was joined with Tournour, becauſe he was known to have traded much

much into Holland, which might be a creditable *pretence* as well for his going as ſtay in the Low Countries. If, therefore, Tournour was afraid to truſt himſelf in Harlem, notwithſtanding his diſguiſe of *ſhaving his beard* and *his hair*, both of which muſt ſoon grow again, there was no reaſon to reſtrain Caxton, who was to appear *public and known*, from entering the town, and managing the deſign himſelf on the ſpot, much better than by communicating the ſecret of their journey to ſo many people as they were obliged to bribe and employ in it. It was fortunate that ſuch conſiderable ſums as they expended did not alarm the jealouſy of a people ſo attentive to prevent the art from being known. The opinion that there were two Guttenbergs doth not ſeem to be proved from this indiſtinct and conjectural account. I know of no other; and therefore cannot make the ſilence of all our Engliſh hiſtorians, Fabian, Hollinſhed, Stow, Baker, and Caxton, about it, prove that the author muſt have had his *information from one who took it from* the moſt *authentic* documents. I ſhould rather think this ſilence in theſe hiſtorians affords a contrary inference; and that we ſtill very much want ſome of theſe *authentic documents* [g].

Middleton had urged the improbability of this journey taking place when the king's affairs were in ſuch a dangerous ſtate that he might be ſaid to be fighting for his crown againſt the Duke of York. Mr. Meerman, Bowyer, and Nichols, anſwer this objection, by ſaying, that, notwithſtanding this dangerous ſtate, Henry the Sixth was able to attend to his two great eſtabliſhments of Eton college, and King's college, at Cambridge. They muſt certainly know that the king's affairs were in a very different ſtate in 1441, when theſe noble eſtabliſhments took place; when every thing was quiet, his ſituation proſperous, and ſuited to ſuch great buſineſs, from

[g] Bowyer, p. 5.

that

that in which it was in 1459, while the civil war was raging with ſuch violence as ended in the loſs of his crown to Edward early in 1461 [*b*].

Surely thoſe great erections cannot be ſaid to have been made *during all* his *troubles*, as they were performed in 1441.

We know that Henry's queen, who began Queen's college 1448, a conſiderable time after 1441, was obliged to relinquiſh her deſign on account of theſe troubles, though then only beginning, and not ſo formidable as they proved afterwards: ſuch a ſum as 1500 marks would have been more wanted for the ſupport of his war in 1459 than for the uncertain introduction of this new art, however conſiderable, into England.

But to reſume the ſubject of the two Guttenburgs. De Boze was puzzled about it, as Guttenberg is ſometimes called by that name ſimply, and at other times he is ſtyled *Geinsfleſh*. This difficulty occaſioned his writing to Shoefflin, at Straſburg. He returned him an account of his authorities that cleared it up; they are from the ancient regiſters of the chapter-houſe in the collegiate church of St. Thomas in that city, and ſeem to be atteſtations to a conveyance, in which Guttenberg is a witneſs; "Joannes dictus Gensfleiſch, *alias* nuncupatus *Guttenburg* de *Moguntia*, Argentinæ commorantes, et ſtrenuus vir Rutholdus de Ramſtein, miles." The ſecond atteſtation is to another deed, and begins thus: "Joannes dictus Gensfleiſch, *alias Gutenberg de Moguntia*;" the firſt atteſtation is found in the volume marked B, fol. 293, and dated the 25th of March, 1441; the ſecond in the ſame volume, fol. 302, dated 17th November 1442; it is apparent that Gensfleiſch and Guttenberg were two names of the ſame man [*i*].

[*b*] Bowyer, p. 8. [*i*] Acad. des Inſcript. Vol. XIV. p. 229.

If

If we ſhould admit the authenticity of this MS. what are we to think of the long interval from 1459 to 1468, before the nation derived any benefit from this introduction of the art into England? What became of Corſellis after his ſettlement at Oxford? Are we to be ſatisfied with this ſingle performance? In the caſe of Caxton we find a continued ſeries of printing by him; after he began to print, we find a ſucceſſion of printers bred under him, exerciſing and diffuſing the art; ſhall we think that a man, brought into England for the expreſs purpoſe of printing, and teaching to print, ſhould have been ſo unfortunate, as to leave no other memorial of his diligence, except this one inſtance; no ſcholars bred under him? for the book at St. Albans in 1480 diſcovers a type like Caxton's, and very different, though printed with fuſile metal types, from thoſe in the Oxford book, in 1468. This I ſay poſitively, as I have the former book, and have examined it. Mr. Bowyer obviates this by ſaying, that, if we conſider that the Oxford printer met with ſmall encouragement, printed probably but *few* books, and *did not put his name* to them, it is no wonder that his name and memory ſhould be ſoon loſt; nor is it ſurpriſing that Caxton ſhould run away with the credit of being the firſt printer, who lived many years in great repute, printed a conſiderable number of books, and flouriſhed in the ſunſhine of a court. Where do they learn that Corſellis printed ſo few books, &c.? I am aſhamed to treſpaſs ſo much on the patience of any reader, in giving the whole of Bowyer's apology for this long ſilence; but, if I had not done it, I queſtion if I ſhould have been credited in giving a part of it only. What, did Caxton flouriſh in the ſunſhine of a court, and Corſellis not? Corſellis brought over, at the expence and order of a prince himſelf, of an archbiſhop of Canterbury, who lived twenty-three years after he was brought over,

who had the advantage of being ſo many years earlier than Caxton, when it would have been thought early even on the Continent, when the art muſt have excited more admiration and curioſity than Caxton could expect, who came fifteen years after him? when ſuch powerful patrons intereſted themſelves in his ſucceſs? and, though probably ſome of the books printed by him have been loſt, we cannot allow all of them, but this one book, to have experienced this misfortune, when we ſee ſuch a regular and numerous ſeries of theſe printed by Caxton have reached our times.

The reader hath now had the reaſons of my ſuſpecting that this MS. is a mere fable; they are, at leaſt many of them, thoſe mentioned by other writers in this diſpute; but have they been anſwered? Confident aſſertions are not anſwers; it is to connect into one view all that hath been written about it, that I unite them; though my own opinion, which I do not wiſh to intrude on any perſon, when they have examined what hath been now offered, is, that this ſtory of Corſellis reſembles very much that of Junius, about Harlem and Coſter; both of them fabricated at remote periods from the origin of the art, neither of them heard of till a Dutchman's vanity in favour of his own country, and a worſe motive in an Engliſhman, brought them forth.

Junius's Account.

" Cornelii bibliopegi, quondam famuli Laurentii Jo. fil. Harlemenſis, teſtimonium de heri ſui inventionibus; quod ſervavit *Hadr. Junius* in Batavia, p. 253, ſeq. edit. Lugd. Batav. 1588, 4to.

" Redeo ad urbem noſtram (Harlemum), cui primam inventæ iſthic artis typographicæ gloriam deberi, et ſummo jure aſſerendam

rendam aio, utpote propriam et nativam : ſed luminibus noſtris ſola officit inveterata illa et quæ encauſti modo inſcripta eſt animis opinio, tam altis innixa radicibus, quas nulli ligones, nulli cunei, nulla rutra revellere aut eruere valeant ; qua pertinaciter credunt, et perſuaſiſſimum habent apud Magontiacum claram et vetuſtam Germaniæ urbem primo repertas literarum formulas quibus excuderentur libri. Utinam hic incredibilem illam dicendi vim, quæ in Carneade fuiſſe perhibetur, voto exoptare poſſem, qui nihil defendiſſe unquam quod non probarit, nihil oppugnaſſe quod non everterit, dicitur ; ut ſaltem refugam illam laudem poſtliminio revocare, et hoc quaſi trophæum erigere poſſem veri interpolator : quod ego non alio optarim, quam ut veritas rectè à poeta vetere temporis filia nuncupata, aut (ut ego ſoleo) χρονε ελεγχος, tandem detegatur, quæque juxta Democritum, altiſſimo in puteo demerſa hactenus delituit, in apertum proferatur. Si glorioſum certamen ſuſcipere non piguit Ægyptios et Phœnicas de literarum inventione, his Deo duce earum inventum ad ſe trahentibus, quando tabulas θεοχαρακτες, hoc eſt, a Deo exaratas jactant ; illis a ſe repertas Græciæ intuliſſe gloriantibus, quando Cadmus Phœnicum claſſe vectus, rudibus Græcorum populis artis illius auctor, eas commonſtravit. Rurſus ſi Athenienſes Cecropi ſuo, Thebani Lino, eandem laudem vindicant : Palamedi Argivo excogitatorum characterum gloriam Tacitus et Philoſtratus deferunt : ut Hyginus Latinorum Carmentæ Evandri matri. Si itaque controverſam dubiamque gloriam cunctæ gentes ad ſe ceu propriam rapere non erubuerunt, quid vetat quo minus indubitandæ laudis poſſeſſionem, de qua per ſocordiam avitam exturbati ſumus, quaſi poſtliminii jure repetamus ? Equidem non invidia, aut malevolentiæ ſtudio tranverſus agor, ut huic aſſeram, quod alteri derogem ac detraham. Craſſi impudentiam non imitabor, hinc Scævolæ ſanctimoniam et gravitatem affectando, illinc præ-

henſationibus favorem hominum eblandiendo: haud is ſum; corruptis arbitriis planum agere non decrevi, veritatem illam unam perſpicuam, quam uti cœleſte ſolis jubar, nulla nox, nulla caligo, quamtumvis alta, obtenebrare poteſt, exhibiturus, quantum in me eſt, idque *ſimplici ac minime fucato orationis filo*, quod illa amat. Quod ſi optimus ille teſtis eſt, auctore Plutarcho, qui nullo obſtrictus beneficio, neque alterius addictus ſtudio, libere quod ſentit loquitur et intrepide, meum teſtimonium merito locum habeat, qui nec mortuum aut hæredes, poſteroſve cognatione attingam, neque gratiam aut beneficium inde expectem, qui quicquid hujus feci, id totum ſepultis manibus pietatis ergo impendi. Dicam igitur quod accepi a ſenibus et auctoritate gravibus, et Reipub. adminiſtratione claris, quique a majoribus ſuis ita accepiſſe graviſſimo teſtimonio confirmarunt, quorum auctoritas jure pondus habere debeat ad faciendam fidem."—Now for theſe authorities.

" Habitavit ante annos centum duodetriginta Harlemi in ædibus ſatis ſplendidis (ut documento eſſe poteſt fabrica quæ in *hunc uſque diem* perſtat *integra)* foro imminentibus a regione palatii regalis, Laurentius Johannes cognomento Ædituus Cuſtoſve (quod tunc opimum et honorificum munus familia eo nomine clara hæreditario jure poſſidebat) is ipſe qui nunc laudem inventæ artis typographicæ recidivam juſtis vindiciis ac ſacramentis repetit, ab aliis nefarie poſſeſſam et occupatam, ſummo jure omnium triumphorum laurea majore donandus. *Is forte* in ſuburbano nemore ſpatiatus (ut ſolent ſumpto cibo aut feſtis diebus cives qui otio abundant) cœpit *faginos cortices* principio in literarum typos conformare, quibus inverſa ratione ſigillatim chartæ impreſſis verſiculum unum atque alterum animi gratia ducebat, nepotibus generi ſui liberis exemplum futurum. Quod ubi feliciter ſucceſſerat, cœpit animo altiora (ut erat ingenio magno et ſubacto) agitare;

tare, primumque omnium atramenti ſcriptorii genus glutinoſius tenaciuſque, quod vulgare lituras trahere experiretur, cum genere ſuo *Thoma Petro,* qui quaternos liberos reliquit omnes ferme conſulari dignitate functos (quod eo dico ut artem in familia honeſta et ingenua, haud ſervili, natam intelligant omnes) excogitavit; inde etiam pinaces totas figuratas additis characteribus expreſſit. Quo in genere vidi ab ipſo excuſa Adverſaria, operarum rudimentum paginis ſolum adverſis, haud opiſtographis; is liber erat vernaculo ſermone ab auctore conſcriptus anonymo, titulum præferens, *Speculum noſtræ ſalutis*; in quibus id obſervatum fuerat inter prima artis incunabula (ut nunquam ulla ſimul et reperta et abſoluta eſt) uti paginæ averſæ glutine commiſſæ cohæreſcerent, ne illæ ipſæ vacuæ deformitatem adferrent. Poſtea faginas formas plumbeis mutavit, has deinceps ſtanneas fecit, quo ſolidior *minuſque* flexilis eſſet materia, durabiliorque: e quorum typorum reliquiis quæ ſuperfuerant conflata œnophora vetuſtiora adhuc *hodie* viſuntur in Laurentianis illis, quas dixi, ædibus in forum proſpectantibus, habitatis poſteo a ſuo pronepote Gerardo Thoma, quem honoris cauſa nomino, cive claro, ante paucos hos annos vita defuncto ſene. Faventibus, ut fit, invento novo ſtudiis hominum, quum nova merx, nunquam antea viſa, emptores *undique* exciret cum huberrimo quæſtu, crevit ſimul artis amor, crevit miniſterium, additi familiæ operarum miniſtri, prima mali labes, quos inter *Joannes* quidam, ſive is (ut fert ſuſpicio) Fauſtus fuerit ominoſo cognomine, hero ſuo infidus et infauſtus, *ſive alius* eo nomine, non magnopere laboro, quod ſilentum umbras inquietare nolim, contagione conſcientiæ quondam dum viverent tactas. Is ad operas excuſorias ſacramento dictus, poſtquam artem jungendorum characterum, *fuſilium typorum* peritiam, quæque alia eam ad rem ſpectant, percalluiſſe ſibi viſus eſt, captato opportuno tempore, quo non potuit magis idoneum inveniri, ipſa nocte quæ Chriſti

Chriſti natalitiis ſolennis eſt, qua cuncti promiſcue luſtralibus ſacris operari ſolent, *choragium omne typorum* involat, *inſtrumentorum herilium ei artificio comparatorum ſupellectilem* convaſat, deinde cum fure domo ſe proripit, Amſtelodamum principio adit, inde Coloniam Agrippinam, donec Moguntiacum perventum eſt, ceu ad aſyli aram, ubi quaſi extra telorum jactum (quod dicitur) poſitus tuto degeret, ſuorumque furtorum *aperta officina*, fructum huberem meteret. Nimirum ex ea, intra *vertentis anni ſpatium*, ad annum a nato Chriſto 1442 iis ipſis typis, quibus Harlemi Laurentius fuerat uſus, prodiſſe in lumen certum eſt Alexandri Galli *Doctrinale*, quæ Grammatica celeberrimo tunc in uſu erat, cum Petri Hiſpani *tractatibus*, prima fœtura. Iſta ſunt ferme quæ a ſenibus annoſis fide dignis, et qui tradita de manu in manum quaſi ardentem tædam in decurſu acceperant, olim intellexi, et alios eadem referentes atteſtanteſque comperi. Memini narraſſe mihi Nicolaum Galium, pueritiæ meæ formatorem, hominem ferrea memoria et longa canitie venerabilem, quod *puer* non ſemel audierit *Cornelium* quendam bibliopegum ac ſenio gravem, nec octogenario minorem (qui in eadem officina ſubminiſtrum egerat) tanta animi *contentione* ac fervore commemorantem rei geſtæ ſeriem, inventi (ut ab *hero* acceperat) rationem, rudis artis polituram et incrementum, aliaque id genus, ut invito quoque præ rei indignitate *lacrymæ erumperent*, quoties de plagio inciderat mentio; tum vero ob ereptam furto gloriam ſic ira exardeſcere ſolere ſenem, ut etiam lictoris exemplum eum fuiſſe editurum in plagiarium appareret, ſi vita illi ſuperfuiſſet: tum devovere conſueviſſe *diris ultricibus ſacrilegum caput*, nocteſque illas damnare atque execrari, quas una cum ſcelere illo, communi in cubili per aliquot menſes exegiſſet. Quæ non diſſonant à verbis Quirini Taleſii Coſ. eadem fere ex ore *librarii ejusdem* ſe olim accepiſſe mihi confeſſi. Iſta

dictare

dictare me compulit cupiditas et ſtudium defendendæ veritatis, quamvis illa odium ſui plerumque parere ſoleat; in qua tuenda potius quam ut deſerere vadimonium velim, ad ſuſcipiendum odium paratior ſim ac promptior. Nam iſtud facile ponent, qui rem ipſam ſincere et candide indagabunt et expendent, tanquam in Critolai bilance appenſam: at veritatis, quæ Dei imago quædam eſt, qui non libenter patrocinium ſuſcipiat, vix hominis appellationem mereri exiſtimo, cujus cura atque amore nihil cuiquam vel ſanctius vel antiquius eſſe debet. Tuendo veritatem et conſtabit ſuus urbi noſtræ honos, in cive ereptam inventionis pulcherrimæ gloriam recuperaturæ, et cadet eorum arrogantia, quos falſam alienæ gloriæ hæreditatem cernere non puduit, et quaſi dejectis de ponte ſexagenariis alieni juris poſſeſſionem ſuperbe uſurparunt. At vereor ut *ſurdis iſta* auribus canantur; utcunque tamen erit, juvabit me et memoriæ inventoris et gloriæ urbis pro virili conſuluiſſe, dum apud leves et veri incurioſos animos plus valet præjudicium opinionis (quod antea quoque teſtatus ſum) quam cum ratione auctoritas. Quæ injuria muſſitanda eſt et devoranda parum lubentibus. Quanquam dolendum minus foret eam laudem in clariſſimam Germaniæ urbem, velut aliam in familiam, tranſiſſe, ſi non *plagio*, ſed recta ratione factum id fuiſſet. Verum arbitror ſatis volentibus hanc viam commodiſſimam viſam, uti citiſſime ad nitorem ſuum ac perfectionis culmen perveniret inventum illud, orbi ſale (quod dicitur) et ſole magis neceſſarium, nimirum in majore luce hominum, per ſtudia, magnatum præmia, et honores (quibus artes aluntur) facilius emerſurum, uti accidiſſe res docuit, quam in extremo orbis terrarum ſeceſſu quodam et recondito angulo, inter hominum privatorum ſordes [*a*]."

The faireſt, and I believe the moſt ſatisfactory way, will be to inſert the obſervations at the foot of the reſpective au-

[*a*] Meerman, tom. II. p. 89—95.

thorities

thorities adduced to ſupport the claims of Harlem and Mentz. That of Junius ſhould be the firſt taken notice of; it is the fulleſt, and probably was the firſt, and on which all the ſubſequent ones have been taken; the account hath been given: as Malinkrot hath been very particular in his obſervations on it, I will give what he ſays, although it may be thought tedious.

He aſks why Coſter made choice of the *bark*, not the wood, of the beech tree, to make his letters on; the bark muſt be too tender for the office aſſigned to them: Secondly, as Coſter was carving ſingle letters on this bark, for the uſe and inſtruction of his *grand children*, whether he could hope to make with his knife, on *ſuch* materials, ſuch correct letters as any ſchoolmaſter would have ſupplied him with? how he could diſpoſe theſe letters, ſo as to compoſe a *word*, eſpecially, as he owns, in another place, that *printers* ink was not then found out; (to which I muſt add, how could ſuch tender materials bear the ſtroke of the *printing preſs?*) and even, when he had improved his bark types into *leaden* ones, ſimply, and not hardened with other metals, they muſt be found unequal to this great preſſure; but his ſurprize is increaſed when he conſiders the number to be ſo great, even after the theft by Fuſt, as to make veſſels for *holding liquors*, he thinks it would have been more natural to have preſerved them, and added ſuch new ones as might be wanted to carry on ſuch a *lucrative trade* as he allows it to have been; beſides, theſe veſſels made with the reliques of the printing *apparatus*, muſt be made with very durable wood to have laſted till the time of Junius, about 140 years, and even Coſter's houſe muſt have been well built, as they were then moſtly of wood, to have laſted ſo long; but this houſe, and theſe veſſels, ſeem to have been unknown to thoſe early writers, who treated the ſubject

of

of early printing, long before Junius took it up: he urges that Fuſt took his time wrong in committing the theft on Chriſtmas day, as that feſtival was more likely to encreaſe the number of idle people, whoſe curioſity to diſcover ſomething of an art ſo carefully concealed, expoſed *Coſter's* houſe to more danger then, than at any other time, and ſhould have redoubled his vigilance; he obſerves, that *Fuſt*, very abſurdly, encumbered his flight with ſuch a vaſt load (Chevillier ſuppoſes not leſs than 1000lb.) which, as he was acquainted with the ſecret of the art, he might ſo eaſily ſupply himſelf with, to any place he might fly to; and probably, without a *crime*, have eſtabliſhed himſelf in; that after his flight, and getting out of a *walled* town, and that better guarded at that time than commonly, on account of the riots and debauchery incident to ſuch a feſtival, he ſhould ſtop at Amſterdam, within two hours eaſy walk, where he might be ſpeedily apprehended, as the intercourſe between the two towns was inceſſant; that he ſhould then proceed no farther than Cologn, where he might be ſecured; and laſtly, to Mentz, where he was allowed to ſettle quietly, and without moleſtation, or complaint to any magiſtrates about the robbery; he might thus recover all his types, &c. (if he could not do without them) and have renewed the profits of ſuch a beneficial trade, inſtead of *weakly* giving them up, and converting the remainder of his ſtock into drinking veſſels, or veſſels for holding liquors; but it is laughable to hear an old fellow, Cornelius, fellow ſervant with Fuſt at Coſter's, and then *eighty* years old, threatning what he would do with Fuſt if he lived a little longer, and could meet with him; the theft was in 1441, and Fuſt lived till 1466, twenty-five years after the theft, long enough to have allowed Cornelius time to execute theſe threats, and when he certainly was better able

to execute them. Malinkrot's obſervations are, perhaps, ſufficient to invalidate this account of Junius: I ſhall only obſerve, that this account of Junius is ſuch a piece of *oratory* as is unneceſſary in an inveſtigation of truth, and ſeems to be built chiefly on *popular* opinion. As he appears to be diffident himſelf of the ſucceſs of his teſtimony, he muſt allow us to be more ſo.

On this ground of *popular opinion*, ſo many other places (at leaſt fifteen in number) having put in their claim, I am not ſurprized to find this from Harlem, which hath better pretenſions than any of them, except Mentz and Straſburg, to this honour. If the Lambeth record is allowed, it is deciſive; but though the credit of that authority is, I hope, conſiderably weakened, it is poſſible that the practice of printing was very early introduced there, and that by *Guttenberg*; in its proper place I ſhall give my reaſons for thinking ſo.

The next voucher for Harlem is, that of Theodorus Volckardus Coornhertius, in dedicatione Belgicæ verſionis Tullii Officiorum, edit. Harlem 1561.

Addreſſing himſelf to the *Senate of that town*, he ſays:

'Viri ſpectatiſſimi prudentiſſimique, ſæpe mihi *bona fide* narratum eſt, utiliſſimam artem Typographicam in hac urbe Harlemenſi, etſi modo perquam rudi, inventam eſſe; emendare enim inventa et ad majorem gradum perfectionis perducere facilius eſt, quam nova invenire. Poſtea hanc artem ſervus quidam perfidus Moguntiam tranſtulit, ibique perfectiorem reddidit, et huic ſimul urbi inventionem hujus artis, ſimulatque fama ejus rei divulgata eſſet, conciliavit; adeo ut cives noſtri, quando hunc honorem vero inventori adſcribunt, vix apud *quemquam fidem inveniant*, cum tamen res ipſa a *multis* in *noſtra urbe*, propter notitiam *certiſſimam* omnino credatur; et a civibus *veteranis*

nis cunctis extra omnem dubitationis aleam ponatur. Neque me fugit, famam illam de *Moguntia* ob majorum noſtrorum incuriam temerariam omnium mentibus tam *altis infixam eſſe radicibus,* ut nullum argumentum, quamvis evidentiſſimum, certiſſimum, et *invictiſſimum* fuerit, inveteratam illam opinionem ex illorum animis evellere queat. Sed quoniam veritas, etiamſi paucis ſit nota, veritas tamen manet, idcirco ego quoque rem modo narratam certiſſimam eſſe credo, convictus teſtimoniis fide digniſſimis *virorum ſenio et authoritate gravium,* qui non ſolum de familia inventoris Harlemenſis, ſed etiam de ejus *nomine et cognomine* me ſæpe certiorem reddiderunt; imo primum impreſſionis modum rudiorem deſcripſerunt, et primi *Typographi* ædes indice digito olim monſtrarunt. Itaque non invidia honoris alieni, ſed amore veritatis inductus, intermittere haud potui, quin hanc rem ad gloriam promeritam urbi noſtræ vindicandam paucis attingerem. Hæc honeſta et juſta honoris cupido videtur etiam in cauſa fuiſſe, cur typographia in hac urbe ad inſtar ſurculi e radicibus arboris vetuſtæ denuo efflоruerit atque incepta fuit. Etenim ſæpe contiget, ut *cives noſtri* in *congreſſum, colloquiumque* venientes, quererentur, alios hoc honore immerito frui, atque adhuc a *nemine* poſt *illud tempus* (ſic illi *ne ullo quidem contradicente* loquebantur) hanc artem in noſtra urbe exercitam eſſe. His quotidianis dictis effectum eſt id, ut ego ſociique mei, qui honeſtum laborem otio preferunt, conſilium de typographia Harlemi conſtituenda in hujus urbis honorem, aliorum emolumentum noſtrumque commodum abſque ullius hominis damno promovendum, ceperimus."

This flouriſhing account was publiſhed twenty-ſeven years before that of Junius, and probably ſuggeſted the other by him: Junius, however, embelliſhed it with many particulars ſeemingly unknown to Volckard, though writing ſo re-

cently before him; he thought proper to bring in the beachen letters on bark, and Coſter's ſolitary walk in the wood, &c. though the former ſays not a word of Coſter himſelf.

This teſtimony goes no further than to eſtabliſh the general and popular belief at Harlem; he honeſtly owns that he did not expect to overcome the prejudice in favour of Mentz, he may therefore allow us to retain ours in favour of that city, until better authorities than theſe adduced by him are produced. Guicciardin's account is the next to be noticed, and is as follows, in ſpeaking of Harlem:

" In hac urbe, non modo juxta publicam *incolarum*, aliorumque *Hollandorum* vocem, ſed et ſcriptores *quoſdam*, aliaque monumenta, inventa primum ars fuit imprimendi, et literas charactereſque in chartam transferendi, hodie recepta. Verum auctore ante perfectam evulgatamque artem *defuncto*, hujus *famulus*, ut *narrant*, Moguntiam abiit, ubi eandem in lucem prodiens perbenignè fuit exceptus. Illic autem data porro arti eſt opera tanta cum diligentia atque induſtria, ut ad integram ejus cognitionem plenamque perfectionem ventum fuerit, unde divulgata poſt hac tandemque inveterata eſt fama, natam ea in urbe artem ſcientiamque impreſſoriam. Quid hac in parte vero ſit conſentaneum judicare nec poſſum nec volo, ſufficere arbitratus, aliquid ea de re *obiter* commemoraſſe, ne iſti urbi,, regionique gravis ſim."

In this account he acquits Fuſt of the ſuppoſed robbery, and gives a more reaſonable account of the ſettlement of the art at Mentz. It may be obſerved that he gives no opinion of his own, but ſeems diffident of the claim of Harlem; indeed, if he had been more decided, I ſhould give but little credit to his opinion, given at ſuch a diſtance of time and place from the invention. Guicciardin wrote in Italy, long after the diſcovery of the art (120 years), and ſpeaks of it only ſlightly

(obiter),

(obiter), in his deſcription of the Low Countries; it is only incidentally introduced, and in that general way as would not ſettle a diſpute that exerciſed the pens of the ableſt writers, who lived in the neighbourhood, and nearer the time of the invention, and who were treating it *profeſſedly* at that time.

If any farther proof ſhould be thought wanting to invalidate the force of Guicciardin's account, it may be inferred from a book mentioned by Maittaire, ſuppoſed by him to have been printed in 1471. It is to be found in the Colophon to an edition of Pliny's Epiſtles, and is as follows.

" Sine loco et typographo; ſed in editoris epiſtolâ dedicatoriâ leguntur hæc; " Ludovicus Carbo Sal. Plu. dicit illuſtriſſimo et excellentiſſimo principi Borgio, duci Mutinæ ac Regii, marchioni Æſtenſi, comitique Radigii. Gratulari licet ſæculo noſtro, dive Borſi, dux præſtantiſſime; in quo certè optimarum artium ſtudia maximè floreant; eloquentia et legitima illa eruditio ſuum tandem decus agnoſcat; in priſtinamque dignitatem reſtituta ſit, adeò latè pateat Romana et Græca facundia ut jam et Galli et Britanni bonos oratores et poëtas habere videantur: ad quam quidem rem commodiſſimum adjumentum præſtiterunt nobiliſſima *Germanorum* ingenia, *qui* artificioſiſſimas imprimendorum librorum formas *excogitárunt*, ut ſapientiſſimorum auctorum plurima ſimul eodem temporis momento volumina in promptu eſſent; omneſque utiliſſimi codices et in magnâ copiâ et in leviore ſumtu parari poſſent. Imprimiſque has Plinii ſecundi Junioris Epiſtolas operâ meâ emendatas correctaſque impreſſionibus miſi, ut quod rariſſimum eſſe ſolebat, jam commune omnibus fieri incipiat." Mihi probabile videtur hunc librum excuſum fuiſſe à Chriſtophoro Valdarfer, in cujus typographeô Ludovicus Carbo correctoris munere fungebatur." Maittaire, tom I. edit. ſec. p. 302, note 5; and De Bure, from a copy in the Duc de la Valiere's library,

library, are of the ſame opinion; and fix the edition in 1471, much earlier, and ſurely of more weight than Guicciardin's account in favour of Harlem, above an hundred years after, even if it can be tortured to give countenance to the claim of Harlem.

The next, and the ſtrongeſt, in favour of Harlem is, Ulrici Zell teſtimonium, quod ſervavit Auctor Chronici Urbis Coloniæ, anno 1499.

" Item hæc ars digniſſima primum inventa eſt in Germania Moguntiæ ad Rhenum, magnoque Germanicæ nationi honori cedit, tam ingenioſos homines illic reperiri. Accidit autem illud circa annum 1440, et ab eo tempore uſque ad annum 1450, perfectior reddita eſt ars, et quicquid eo pertinebat. Anno autem 1450, qui Jubilæus erat cœptum eſt imprimi, primuſque liber qui excuderetur, *Biblia* fuere *Latina*, impreſſaque ea ſunt *ſcriptura grandiori*, quali nunc Miſſalia ſolent imprimi. Quamvis autem ars reperta fuerit *Moguntiæ*, ut diximus, eo modo qui hodie communiter uſurpatur, prima tamen ejus *præfiguratio* inventa eſt in *Hollandia, ut patet* ex *Donatis*, qui *ibi ante id tempus excuſi ſunt*; atque ab illis et ex illis deſumtum eſt dictæ artis *initium*, ita tamen ut multo præſtantior et ſubtilior poſterior hæc inventio priori fuerit, et magis magiſque excultior reddita. Auctor quidam Omnibonus dictus, ſcribit in præfatione Quintiliano præmiſſa, aliiſque in libris, Gallum aliquem, nomine Nicolaum Genſon, primum egregiam hanc artem reperiſſe; quod tamen aperte falſum eſt. Superſunt enim adhuc in vivis qui teſtari poſſunt Venetiis libros excuſos fuiſſe, priuſquam Nicolaum Genſon illuc adveniſſet, ubit ypos ſculpere et præparare cepit. Verum *primus* typographiæ inventor civis fuit Moguntinus, patria Argentinenſis, dictus Joannes Guttenburg, eques. Moguntia autem dicta ars primo *Coloniam* delata eſt, poſtmodum Argentinum,

tinum, ac deinceps *Venetias*. Initium et progreſſum hujus artis narravit mihi honorabilis magiſter, *Ulricus Zell*, de Hanau, impreſſor Coloniæ hoc ipſo adhuc tempore anno 1499, cujus beneficio ars hæc Coloniam delata eſt. Reperiuntur ſcioli aliquot, qui perhibent, jam *olim* libros impreſſos eſſe, ſed veritati illud repugnat; nuſquam enim terrarum libri eo tempore excu: reperiuntur."

There are, I think, two different authorities in this account; the firſt, that of *Zell*, which may have conſiderable weight; the other is that of the author of the Chronicle; that, perhaps, deſerves very little, as will be ſeen by the teſtimonies I ſhall adduce of the moſt reſpectable German writers; he ſays the art was carried to Cologn by this *Zell*, and yet we know of no book printed there, and that not by him, earlier than 1470, unleſs a very curious one, given to us by Meerman, is allowed to have been printed there: it is a little tract of St. Auſtin, "de Singularitate Clericorum," in 1467; the Colophon doth not ſay *where* it was printed; but, taking it for granted, from the author of this Chronicle, that *Zell* was the firſt printer at Cologn, Meerman gives it to that city; he ſays it was carried firſt to *Cologn*, then to Straſburgh; all the writers agree it was carried firſt to Straſburgh; and if dates determine the queſtion, we know the Straſburgh Bible is in 1466, and that there are others ſtill earlier from that preſs; he then carries the art to Venice; the firſt book printed there is by John Spire, only in 1469; the Lactantius, at a monaſtery near Rome, is in 1465; the St. Auſtin in 1467; the Speculum Roderici Zamorenſis in 1468, the Oxford book, if the date is allowed, in the ſame year; the Bible at Augſburgh, and the book at Tours, ſtill earlier. In ſuppoſing the art to be carried by Jenſon, he muſt extend the æra another year, for we know of no edition by him before 1470, when the art was diffuſed almoſt every where. Such is the ignorance

norance of this writer, on a ſubject he ſhould have been better acquainted with before we give him credit for aſcertaining the riſe and progreſs of printing; eſpecially, as his account is ſo late as 1499, fifty years from its real origin; when, from the little communication between countries, ſome miſtakes may eaſily be ſuppoſed to happen in the hiſtory of this art. It is well that the exiſtence of an earlier Bible than that of 1462 by Fuſt, ſeems to be eſtabliſhed by a better authority; though I am not certain that thoſe copies of it hitherto produced have done it.

The Donatus ſaid to be printed in *Holland*, (for he doth not ſay Harlem, or a word about Coſter, though the mention of the latter was ſo natural,) from the fragments that have been ſeen of it, is allowed to be on wooden blocks, and may therefore be claimed by Mentz, as well as Harlem; nay, if we believe the account of the Donatus ſhewed by Aldus jun. to Angelus Rocca, on the firſt white leaves of which Mariangelus Accurſius, in the year 1500, (but who, I think, was born ſo early as 1450) had written theſe words in Latin; "this book, and another, the Confeſſionalia, were the *firſt printed books*, and that John Fuſt, the firſt *inventor* of printing, had printed them anno 1450." (Ang. Rocca, in his Bibliot Vaticana. Palmer, p. 50) I ſay, if we credit this account, Mentz, it is plain, has the juſteſt title to it.

In this place it may be mentioned that the other books from wooden blocks cannot be fixed with more certainty at Harlem than at Mentz. The Speculum, Biblia Pauperum, &c. may as fairly be claimed (and I think with ſtronger reaſons) by Mentz as by Harlem; but Mr. Meerman is ſo modeſt in rejecting all of them, except one copy, viz. the Speculum, which he allows to be printed by Coſter, and is that preſerved at *Harlem*, that it is almoſt a pity not to allow him that. He allows

authenticity

authenticity to no other, and ſo ſtrips our curious libraries, at once, of thoſe early ſpecimens of the art which diſtinguiſhes them; for he contends that they were printed much later. As he doth not give us his reaſon for his preference and exception in favour of the Harlem copy, and I have not ſeen it, I can go no farther than the mention of it by him.

It is difficult to give the exact ſenſe of the word *Præfiguratio*; if he means only rude trials, like thoſe by Guttenberg at Straſburgh, he will not do much honour to Coſter, unleſs he could aſſiſt him with another Fuſt to lick this mis-ſhapen offspring into form.

The German writers do not give much credit to this Cologne Chronicle; they ſpeak contemptibly of it. "*Gelenius* & *Werdenhagen*, qui regardent cette Chronique comme un compilation indigeſte de mauvais lambeaux, tout couſues de fables ridicules, recommandent de n'y ajouter aucune foi, à moins qu'elle ne ſe trouve appuiée de quelque autorité plus *reſpectable*." Another ſays of it: "Productum a *quodam* archigrammateo *Colonienſi*. Auctor iſte, uti *anonymus* eſt, ita *recentioris ævi*, preterea damnatus; ideoque fides nulla ei videtur deberi, niſi alterius auctoritate ſublevetur [*a*]."

Beſides, the author of the Chronicle ſays, the art was diſcovered in 1440; Guttenberg, as it appears from his atteſtation, was ſtill at Straſburg in the years 1441 and 1442, and perhaps even in 1443. Meerman, aware of this miſtake, will have it to refer to the invention at Harlem. Will the words ſupport this application of them? is there any mention of Coſter, or indeed of Harlem; unleſs, it is to be comprized in the word Holland? *Omne majus continet in ſe minus.* He allows the Chronicle to have been much reprobated, but though abounding with the abſurdeſt fables, he thinks it may have weight as to *facts*; but a very weak ſilly writer may hurt the

[*a*] Marchand, p. 11.

credit even of *facts*, when he wiſhes to give honour to his own country, and his friend Zell.

Mr. Meerman hath given us the epitaph of Guttenberg, as follows: " D. O. M. S. Joannis Gensflechii ſenioris (this word is artfully added by Meerman, as the reader, not conſulting the original, where it is not found, may be miſled to ſuppoſe Meerman's addition for the original) epitaphium, auctore Adamo Gelthus, quod legitur ad calcem memoriæ Marſilii ab Inghen, edit Heidelb. 1499. Joanni Gensfleiſch, artis impreſſoriæ *repertori*, de omni natione et linguæ optime merito, in nominis ſui memoriam immortalem Adam Gelthus poſuit.

" Oſſa ejus in eccleſia D. Franciſci Moguntina feliciter cubant."

There is no date mentioned; it doth not prove there were two Guttenbergs, though that is plainly the diſtinction he forces on the reader by the addition of *ſenioris*; it doth not prove that it is more applicable to the elder, than to the younger brother. What then is it produced for? to be ſatisfied with his ſole authority that it is the elder brother?

I have thus given ſuch of the authorities cited by him as are favourable to the cauſe of Harlem. I am not conſcious that I have omitted any that have the leaſt weight, and lay within the fifteenth century, to which period I wiſh to confine the enquiry. It is proper now to bring forwards thoſe in favour of the firſt invention by Guttenberg at Straſburg before he joined Fuſt at Mentz; I ſhall ſelect thoſe that are of any conſequence.

In the law-ſuit between George Dritzehen and Guttenberg, determined by the Senate of Straſburgh in 1439, on a claim by Dritzehen for monies due from the latter, on account, as it ſeems, for the attempts made in the invention of this art, which J. Guttenberg agreed to diſcover and inſtruct Andrew Dritzehen

Dritzehen to proſecute, Andrew died before this was done; and his brother George brings this ſuit to oblige Guttenberg to refund certain monies he had received on that account from Andrew, or to reveal the art to him, as he had ſtipulated to do with Andrew, but which Guttenberg contended was *limited* to Andrew, and that therefore his brother had no claim to the ſatisfaction of the agreement.

It will be ſufficient to give ſuch examinations of the witneſſes as have reference to the ſuppoſed invention of printing. Theſe examinations ſeem to indicate that attempts had been made, and ſome diſcoveries effected in the diſcovery; but ſo imperfectly, that they were not completed till the purſe and ingenuity of Fuſt enabled Guttenberg to do it at Mentz afterwards. The firſt is,

" Item Conradus Saſpach dixit, Andream Heilman aliquando ad ſe in plateam mercatorum veniſſe et dixiſſe: Mi Conrade, cum Andreas Dritzehen mortuus ſit, et tu *prælum* confeceris, reique conſcius ſis, abi, exime prælo *paginas*, diſjice illas, et nemo ſciet quid rei ſit; ſed cum his teſtis id facere voluiſſet, et ita proxime præterito die S^ti^ Stephani ſcrutatus eſſet, opus jam fuiſſe ſublatum [*a*].

" Laurentius Beldeck dixit, ſe aliquando a Joanne Guttenberg ad Nicolaum Dritzehen poſt mortem Andreæ fratris ejuſdem, miſſum eſſe, ut ipſi nuntiaret, ne *prælum*, quod apud ſe haberet, cuiquam monſtraret; idque ſe curaſſe. Addidit, Guttenberg ipſi inſuper mandaſſe, ut ſubito ad præla ſe conferret, et illud prælum quod duabus cochleolis munitum eſſet, aperiret, ut *paginæ* dilabantur in partes, eaſque partes vel intra vel ſupra prælum poneret. Ita neminem rem vel inſpecturum, vel aliquid ejus intellecturum [*b*]."

It may be obſerved, if that matter wanted any other proof, that, in the adjudication of this law-ſuit, the Senate of Straſ-

[*a*] Meerman. p. 62. t. 2. [*b*] Ibid p. 67.

burg ſtyle it " Georgius Dritzehen, agens contra Joannem Gensfleiſch ex Moguntia, *dictum Guttenberg.*"

After the ſeparation of Guttenberg from Fuſt about the year 1455, it is probable that he retired to Harlem, and ſet up a printing preſs in that town; though it is alſo contended that he went firſt to Straſburg. If he eſtabliſhed himſelf at the former of theſe places, we ſhall not want the help of the Lambeth MS. to aſcertain the early introduction of the art there; and the popular opinion ſo ſoon and generally taken up, that the art was invented there, will be well accounted for. The firſt proof is from Maittaire, vol. I. p. 31. " Joannes Guttenbergius, quem exorta inter ipſum et Fauſtum contentione migraſſe ſcribit *Salmuth*, Harlemum, unde aliquando profectus eſt; ibique primus artem typographicam a ſe inventam monſtraverit, et ipſe anno 1459 exercuit." He adds, very juſtly, this is a full confutation of Coſter's invention, if it is admitted.

Natalis Comes in his Hiſtoire Univerſelle ſays, " Mais n'y trouvant toute l'encouragement à Straſburg qu'il eſpêroit, il paſſa de là à *Harlem*, où il etablit en 1459 une nouvelle imprimerie [*a*]."

There is no improbability, that, after the ſeparation, Guttenberg might firſt have retired to Straſburg, where he began the invention, and it is ſaid, that, at this time, he inſtructed Mentz in the new art, as he was of an unſettled diſpoſition, which Meerman allows, and that, not ſucceeding there, he might try his fortune at *Harlem* afterwards in 1459. The interval between the ſeparation in 1455 and the eſtabliſhment made in 1459 will allow time enough for ſuch a roving character to make his attempt in both places. Schoepfflin, though poſitive as to Harlem, is not willing to allow that he went firſt to Straſburgh, and ſays, " Sed cur *Argentinam* rediret,

[*a*] Marchand, p. 30.

ubi

ubi ſua conſumpſerat, ubi ſucceſſores ejus Mentelius et Eggeſteinius præla ſua fortiter urgebant. Veri ſimilius eſt Moguntia eum diſceſſiſſe Harlemum. Ita decennalis vitæ Guttenbergianæ lacuna ad annum uſque 1465, quo in Moguntinis documentis rurſus apparet completur [*a*]."

Preſſed by theſe difficulties, Meerman is willing to allow that Guttenberg was at *Harlem*, but, not at the period mentioned by theſe writers. " Natalis Comes ignorantia deceptus *veræ* epochæ, quando *Harlemi* commoratus eſt, ut *artem addiſceret*, ſcilicet anno 1435." (This is taking *new* ground, and contradicts the account that he learnt the art of his brother, and was acquainted with it in 1459; it is contrary to the account that he was at Straſburgh ſo late as 1442.) Alterum vero iter ipſius in eam urbem poſt 1455 ſuſpectum redditur epitaphio Theod. Martini [*b*];" who, however, only ſays the *fuſile metal types* were firſt carried into *Holland* in 1472; but why might not theſe on *wooden blocks*, or the *fuſo-ſculpti*, which he inſiſts ſo much on, be carried there much earlier?

He goes on, " Aut cur duarum malim (poſtea aperiam) Harlemum, Gutenbergii (iter ſcilicet) quem quidem *Argentinam* migraſſe, potior vero de qua deinceps diſſeram authoritas, Harlemi conſediſſe affirmat hæc primæ ſuæ artis molitus rudimenta; non qui ante ann. 1455, quo fatetur accidiſſe inter ſe Fauſtumque diſſidium, quod ipſi fuit migrandi cauſa, neque forſan multo poſt 1457, quo perfectior innoluerat imprimendi ratio. Veroſimile ergo eſt, Jo. Gensfleichium *juniorem*, ſive Gutenbergium, qui nundinas Aquiſgranenſes *quæſtûs* gratia frequentare erat ſolitus, non longe diſſitum ab hac urbe *Belgium* circa *ann.* 1435 adiiſſe, fratremque ſuum *Laurentii miniſtrum* cominus ſalutaſſe, a quo ex *artis ſecretis nonnulla hauſit*, atque Argentorati in uſus convertere ſtuduit ſuos. [*c*]"

[*a*] Schoeffer, p. 93. [*b*] Meerman. t. II. p. 138. [*c*] Ibid. p. 198.

Where

Where doth he find this brother in the ſervice of Coſter? But the uſe of having two Guttenbergs is now apparent; it is not plain they could *learn* the art, and that *imperfectly*, from Coſter, for they brought the knowledge of the art with them from Mentz. How *lame* and *miſerable* is this account in every part, but the acknowledgment that Guttenberg had been at Harlem!

As this ſeparation, and the cauſe of it, between Fuſt and Guttenberg, is of moment, and curious, the reader will pardon me if I give it at *length*, though Meerman hath kept it back, and refers us only to another book in which it is to be found; the complete account is given by *Marchand* [*a*].

"A la gloire de Dieu, Amen. Soit notoire à tout qui verront ou entendront cette inſtrument publique, qu'en l'année de nôtre Seigneur 1455, indiction troſieme, le Jeudi 6 de Novembre, la premiere année du pontificat de notres très Saint Pere le Pape Calixte III, a comparu ici à Mayence dans le grand parloir des religieux déchauſſées, entre onze heures et midi, par devant moi Notaire, et les témoins ſouſignés, honorable et diſcrete perſonne *Jaques Fuſt*, bourgeois de Mayence, qui au nom de ſon frere *Jean Fuſt*, pareillement préſent, a dit et déclaré manifeſtement, qu'à ce même jour et l'heure préſent, et dans ce même parloir des Religieux déchauſſées, *Jean Guttenberg* devoit voir et entendre prêter à Jean Fuſt un ſerment, conforme à la ſentence prononcée entre eux deux. Et cette ſentence lue en préſence d'honorable perſonne Henry Gunter, Curé de Sainte Chriſtophe de Mayence, de Henri Keffer, et de Bechtoff de Hanau, ſerviteur et valet de Guttenberg; *Jean Fuſt*, poſant la main ſur les Saintes Evangiles, a juré entre les mains de moi notaire public, conformément à la ſentence prononcée, et à un bilet quil m'a remis, et a fait le ſerment ſuivant, de

[*a*] Page 29.

mot

mot à mot: Moi, *Jean Fuſt*, ai emprunté 1550 *florins*, que j'ai remis à Jean Guttenberg, qui ont été employés à notre commun travail, et dont j'ai payé la rente et l'intérêt annuel, dont je dois encore partie. Comptant donc, pour chaque cent florins empruntés, comme eſt dit ci-deſſus ſix florins par an, (very low intereſt at ſuch a period), je lui en demande la rembourſement et l'intérêt conformément à la ſentence prononcée; ce que je prouverai en droit être légitime, en conſéquence de ma prétenſion ſur le dit *Jean Guttenberg*, en préſence de (the ſame witneſſes), et Jean Fuſt m'a demandé un inſtrument authentique, pour lui ſervir en tant et auſſi ſouvent que le beſoin ſeroit. En fois de quoi j'ai ſigné cet inſtrument, et y'ai appoſé mon cachet." The whole demand was for 2000 florins. As this act had *been doubted*, it was publiſhed by *Senckenberg* in 1747.

The ſentence referred to is found in the teſtimony of Salmuth, in Appendice Comment. in Pancirolum ad Tit. 12, ubi ita ſcribit:

"Eodem tempore Moguntiæ commorabatur Joannes Gutenbergius, *honeſtis parentibus* natus, qui proxime ædes Fauſti habitabat. Hic cum animadvertiſſet inſignem hanc artem typographicam, non ſolum omnium ore paſſim celebrari, ſed etiam admodum lucroſam eſſe, familiaritatem cum Fauſto contraxit, et quia opulentus erat, pecuniam ei ad ſumptus neceſſarios obtulit. Quod Fauſto minime ingratum fuit, quandoquidem comperiebat, ſumptus quos in eam artem faciebat quotidie creſcere; et tunc opus chartæ pergamenæ imprimendum ſub manibus habebat. Quapropter cum Gutenbergio convenit et pactus eſt, ut quicquid in illud opus impenderetur, communi utriuſque lucro vel damno cederet. Quoniam vero Fauſtus plus inſumpſerat quam Gutenbergius, neceſſitatem poſtulaſſe arbitrabatur, hic dimidiam ſuam partem exſolvere detractavit; qua ex re cum lis orta eſſet, alter alterum Moguntiæ

in

in jus vocavit, ubi partibus auditis pronunciatum fuit. Si Joannes Fauſtus, *interpoſito* juramento, *affirmare* poſſet omnem pecuniam, quam mutuam ſumpſiſſet in commune opus erogatam, non *autem* in *proprios ipſius uſus* converſam fuiſſe, Gutenbergium ad ſolvendum obligatum eſſe. Cui ſententiæ Fauſtus paruit ſicut ex archetypo inſtrumenti quod etiamnum ſupereſt anno 1455, ſexto Novemb. a Joanne Ulrico Helmaſpergero notario de ea re confectum fuit, liquido demonſtrari poteſt. Unde evidenter apparet Gutenbergium nequaquam *artis typographicæ* inventorem, et primum autorem eſſe, ſed aliquot annis poſtquam ea inventa fuiſſet, a Joanne Fauſto in conſortium adſcitum, pecuniam ei ſuppeditaſſe [*a*]."

Although I cannot allow that Fuſt was the firſt *inventor*, as *Schoffer* honeſtly owns when I come to give his teſtimony, yet, it is ſufficiently proved that he took a conſiderable part in conducting and *improving* the art, beſides his meer aſſiſtance in ſupplying money. Salmuth is poſitive that he retired to Harlem in 1459, and for this he muſt have had good authority, *although the Lambeth MS. was not then known.*

Before I proceed to the authorities in favour of Mentz, it may be proper to finiſh all that hath been urged that hath any relation to the invention at Harlem. Mr. Meerman, to account for ſome of the difficulties in his way, hath imagined another ſpecies of printing, which he calls *fuſo-ſculpti.* His idea will be beſt explained by the obſervations of the writers who confute it. Meerman is ſo attached to this middle improvement between the blocks of wood and wooden types, and the completion of the art by the fuſile moveable metal types, that he will allow no book to have been printed by the latter before the Durand in 1459, and contends *expreſsly* that the two Pſalters of 1457 and 1459, and the Catholicon of 1460, are only printed with the former letters.

[*a*] Malinkrot, p. 76.

I be-

I believe the very ſight of theſe books would be a ſufficient confutation; for I can diſcover no difference that can eſtabliſh the diſtinction. I have them all except the firſt Pſalter, and that I examined and took notes of *myſelf* at Vienna. Till he will give us his criteria for this ſingular opinion, I muſt continue to think they were all printed with the ſame kind of letters, and in the ſame way; indeed, the difference in the time of printing the ſecond Pſalter and the Durand is ſo trifling, that it is not likely the improvement given to the latter ſhould take place in that very ſhort interval. They are both printed in 1459, the Pſalter in Auguſt, and the Durand in October. But now to the authorities againſt this ſuppoſed improvement:

" Pluſieurs auteurs ont compris enfin l'impoſſibilité d'imprimer avec des *lettres de bois,* ils ont imaginées un *autre genre* pour expliquer l'inégalité des caracteres dans ces livres dont nous parlons; ils ont produit, à cette fin, des lettres mobiles, *ſculptées de bronze,* mais par malheur elles rencontrent encore plus de difficulté que celles *de bois*; outre que la *matière* eſt plus dure, elles demandent encore un tems *infini* à être ſculptés. M. Meerman enfin pour ſauver quelques circonſtances établies par lui pour prouver l'Hiſtoire de l'Imprimerie de *Coſter,* a inventé une troiſieme eſpece de lettres. Il fait *fondre le corps* dans des moules, ou *matrices,* pourqu'elles *devient égales,* et en ſuite il fait taillier la lettre au *bout à la main et au couteau.* Mais quand on eſt venu juſqu'à *fondre le corps,* il faut être bien imbécille pour ne pas fondre *auſſi la lettre.* Diſons plutot la vérité; et d'autant plus qu'on rencontre même dans les livres les plus irrégulierement imprimées toujours quelques marques qui décelent la *fonte* des lettres, et avouons ſincerement que toutes *les imprimées* le ſont, ou avec

des *lettres fixes*, gravées ſur *bois*, ou avec des lettres *de fonte* [*a*]." He might ſafely have added that ſome of theſe *little irregularities* are to be found *not only* in the above books reprobated by him, but in others of the very early editions to which he doth not extend his *ſeverity*, but which were gradually corrected as the art improved.

" Je ſuis convaincu que *Guttenberg* a fait faire une aſſez grande quantité de lettres *de bois*, mais je ſuis auſſi *convaincu* qu'on n'a pu taillier à la main la quantité même d'une telle *ègalité et juſteſſe*, pour imprimer avec elles des feuilles *entieres*, et encore moins ces *gros volumes*, comme quelqu'uns prétendent [*b*].

" Mais j'ai remarqué que quelqu'uns ont voulu trouver une troiſieme genre, ſavoir des lettres de *métal*, ſculptées avec des *outils de fer*; mais, ſi on conſidere les inconvéniens qui en doivent naturellement rencontrer en taillant des *lettres ſi petits* avec le fer, dans une matiere *auſſi dure* que l'eſt le métal, même en ſuppoſant que les *corps des lettres* fuſſent de fonte, et *la lettre* ſeulement ſculptée, on ne trouveroit peut-être *deux* lettres *uniformes*; outre qu'il failloit être bien ignorant, après avoir trouvée la *fonte de corps*, ſi l'on ne pouvoit pas trouver auſſi la fonte des *lettres mêmes*, ſur tout quand un *orfevre* s'en mêle [*c*]."

" Longius enim tempus majoreſque ſumtus typorum e metallo quam ligno ſculptura poſtulabat, nec omnis ſemper tolli poterat inequalitas, unde et hos aliquando perforari in medio filoque necti oportuit [*d*]."

Meerman allows they were obliged to connect and keep ſteady theſe letters by paſſing a thread, or line, through every letter of a ſentence, and ſays, he hath often obſerved the hole left by this *miſerable* operation; I never did.

[*a*] Schoeffer, p. 260. [*b*] Ibid. p. 254.
[*c*] Ibid. p. 446. [*d*] Meerman, I. t. p. 27.

" Ce

" Ce trou même, qu'il étoit obligé de ménager à chaque lettre, fait aſſez voir la difficulté qu'il recontroit de joindre les pieces enſemble avec *ſolidité*, outre cela ce trou étoit ſujet à de grands inconvéniens ; enfiler les caracteres d'une ſeule ligne, en faiſant un nœud au bout, ou faire paſſer un fil de droit à gauche par toutes les lignes, l'un et l'autre n'étoit pas ſuffiſant pour ſoutenir l'effort d'une *preſſe* ; il ne pouvoit pas manquer, comme j'ai obſervé, que dans une grande feuille, quelqu'uns des lettres ne *marquaſſent* pas ſur *le papier*." And again, " S'il a fondu des lettres de *plomb*, ſans connoitre la maniere de taillier des poinçons, ou frapper des matrices, ou s'il a voulu façonner au *couteau* des lettres au bout de chaque corps, et ſi il n'employoit que du plomb, matiere nullement capable de reſiſter à la préſſe, et encore plus flexible que le bois, ſur tout quand il eſt trop mince, il n'a pu venir à bout d'imprimer un livre, ſuivant ſes deſirs [*a*]."

Meerman may be excuſed in ſome of theſe miſtakes, as probably he was not acquainted with the *practical* part of *letter-founding* ; if he was even with that of printing. Senſible how much, in this enquiry, depended on a knowledge in both the branches, I have taken great pains to make myſelf acquainted with them ; and have found in Mr. Martin, who hath ſo eminently diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the types for the edition of Shakſpeare, a ready and able maſter, who hath inſtructed me fully in the whole art of letter-founding ; and from this knowledge I have preſumed to ſay, what would have been raſhneſs without it, not only what Schoepfflin hath ſaid, of the difficulties and inconveniences, but what I am confident that Mr. Nichols, ſo complete and able an artiſt as he is himſelf, and ſo candid a man, will allow me to ſay, that Mr. Meerman's *fuſo-ſculpti* are *impoſſible*.

[*a*] Schoeffer.

To finiſh what may be farther ſaid of Coſter and Harlem, it will be proper to caution our extravagant countrymen about the prices they give for the early ſpecimens of the art; thoſe ſuppoſed to be on wooden blocks, the Speculum, &c. Meerman reprobates them all, except one fortunate copy of the Speculum preſerved at Harlem. This hath found grace in his eyes, perhaps, becauſe it is at Harlem. All other copies of theſe early books, ſo much the paſſion of our collectors, he ſuppoſes to be performances of later and bad printers, ſeemingly not aware how much the Harlem claims may be affected by it; for, this copy at Harlem was not known, or indeed any other of Coſter's performances, till about the year 1660, when a fortunate event put that city in poſſeſſion of it, as will appear from the following account of it: "Sciendum nempe eſt, medio fere ſæculo, an. 1654, (or 1650, as ſome ſay,) Hag. Comit. venum expoſitam fuiſſe ciſtam, variis repletam libris, qui per longiſſimum tempus in *familia Laurentiana* cuſtoditi fuerant (and yet never known to Junius, or produced in this controverſy, and, till this lucky event, not one original document could be ſhewed for Harlem). In ea ſcilicet continebantur *Ars moriendi, Hiſtoria Beatæ Virginis ex Cantico Canticorum*, ac *Speculum Latinum* ſecundæ editionis, uno volumine compacta, item *Speculum Belgicum* ex principe editione, et *Figuræ Apocalypſeos S. Joannis*; omnes *impreſſionis Belgicæ* originariæ fœtus. Preterea *Chronicon Colonienſe* anno 1499, primam inventionem artis Hollandiæ tribuens. Denique tres alii libri ſæculo 15 excuſi; nempe *Ciceronis Officia* ex edit. Fauſti 1466. *Speculum Belgicum* Veldenarii, 1483, ac Barthol. Anglici opus modo laudatum ex Belgica verſione, Harlemi 1485, &c. Hunc theſaurum ſenatus Harlemenſis anno 1654, proxeneta quodam *Matham*, (ſculptore, ni fallor, Harlemenſi) *trecentorum florenorum* pretio emi, atque in curia urbis, æternæ memoriæ, aſſer-

aſſervari juſſit. Quæ omnia diſcimus ex J. Vlamingii annotationibus ad Henr. Spiegelii Hartſpiegel [*a*]." The books thus found are all defective and incomplete, though deſcending from Coſter's family.

It may be curious, in this place to trace the art through its ſeveral progreſſes. From the blocks of wood, which only could be employed on the work for which they were carved, an attempt was made to cut *moveable letters* on wood; but this, I am ſatisfied, went no farther than trials; and, if Schoeffer's happy genius had not diſcovered the art of caſting *matrices*, and cutting punches, the art muſt have remained imperfect and barbarous. Many difficulties were ſtill to be overcome; lead alone was too ſoft, and a mixture of hammered iron was added to it; and, with this compoſition, to which tin was ſometimes added, printing was carried on till latterly, when chemiſtry was called in to its aid, and, by the addition of one pound of *Regulus of Antimony* to five pounds of lead, a happy and complete compoſition hath been obtained, hard enough to bear the preſs, and yet ſoft enough to allow the knife, and even the *plane*, for the ſubſequent operations in fitting and completing the letters for the *preſs*. The punch, therefore, of ſteel; the mould of that and wood; the matrix of copper; and this compoſed metal, are all that are neceſſary for letter-founding.

Although I may offend Mr. Nichols by going over again ground that hath been already trodden, in treating the ſubject I muſt not loſe the advantage of offering the authorities in favour of Mentz, as I have done thoſe for Harlem, merely becauſe they have been produced before; if they had been attended to, as well as produced, perhaps there would have been no occaſion for this trouble to myſelf and the reader.

[*a*] Meerman, t. I p. 117.

To

To begin then with our own country. Aldridge, in the Black Book, or Regiſter of the Garter, vol. II. p. 161, publiſhed by Anſtis, ſpeaking of the thirty-fifth year of Henry the Sixth, writes thus:

"In this year of our moſt pious king, 1457, the art of printing books firſt began at *Mentz*, a famous city of *Germany*." N. B. Aldridge was fellow of King's College, Cambridge, 1507; though poſſibly born about the time, he ſays nothing of Turnour's and Caxton's journey, nor one word of Harlem.

Fabian, writing of the year 1457, ſays; After the *opinion* of many writers (this muſt refer to the claim of Straſburgh, adopted by ſeveral), the craft of imprinting books began in a city of Alemagne named *Mayence*, which, ſince that time, hath had wonderful encreaſe."

Caxton, in his Polychronicon, relating the events of 1455, ſays: "About this time the craft of imprinting books was found in Mogunce, in Allemayne; why the craft is multiplied through the world, and books be had great cheap, and in great number, becauſe of the ſame craft."

Caxton was abroad from 1441 to 1471, chiefly in Flanders and Holland, in the very neighbourhood of Harlem, and yet doth not ſeem to have heard of the invention there. We know he was abroad in 1459, the time of Turnour's journey, as he ſays in his Recueil de Troy, at his *great charge* and *trouble*, learning the art of *imprinting*. Suppoſing the art went no farther there than the blocks of wood, in that ſtate it muſt have ſtruck ſuch a curious man, at that time buſied himſelf to learn it, with wonder and aſtoniſhment, and induced him to make ſome mention of it, as the baſis on which the ſubſequent improvements, which Nichols will have it detained

detained him abroad, depended, if he had not been *deſirous* to learn more of it than Corſellis could teach, who went no farther than the blocks of wood [*a*].

Ex epitome rerum Germ. Script. 1502, cap. 65.

"Anno Chriſti 1440, Frederico III. Romanorum imperatore regente, magnum quoddam, ac pene divinum beneficium collatum eſt univerſo terrarum orbi a *Joanne Guttenberg*, Argentinenſi, novo ſcribendi genere reperto. Is enim primus artem impreſſoriam, quam Latiniores vocant *excuſoriam*, in urbe Argentinenſi invenit. Inde *Moguntiam* veniens, eandem feliciter complevit [*b*]."

Hen. Wirczburg de Vach, in faſciculo temporum Werneri Rolevinck de Laer, aucto ad ann. 1457. This was continued afterwards to 1474, and publiſhed 1481. Librorum impreſſionis ſcientia ſubtiliſſima, omnibus ſæculis inaudita, reperitur in urbe *Moguntina* [*c*].

Eraſmus aſcribes explicitly the invention to Mentz and to Fuſt. In his epiſtle dedicatory to an edition of Livy in 1519, printed at Mentz by young Schoeffer; he ſays: "Huic urbi (Moguntiæ) omnes bonarum literarum ſtudioſi, non parum debent, ob egregium illud ac pene divinum inventum, *ſtanneis typis* excudendi libros." He alſo ſays: "Atque hujus quidem laudis præcipua portio debetur hujus, pene divini dixerim, opificii repertoribus, quorum princeps fuiſſe fertur, totius ævi memoria celebrandus, Joannes Fuſt, avus ejus, cui Livium hunc, tum auctum duobus voluminibus, tum innumeris locis ex codice vetuſtiſſimo caſtigatum debemus, ut hoc egregium decus, partim ad Joan. Schoeffer, velut hæreditario jure devolvatur, partim ad *Moguntiacæ* civitatis gloriam pertineat [*d*]." If Eraſmus knew of this invention at Harlem, would his vanity, as a Dutchman, have ſuppreſſed all mention of it?

[*a*] Bowyer. p. 11. [*b*] Meerman, t. II. p. 139. [*c*] Ibid. p. 122. [*d*] Ibid. p. 157.

"Imp-

" Imp. Maximiliani privilegium ad impreſſionem T. Livii per J. Schoeffer, an. 1519.

" Maximilianus, &c. honeſto noſtro, et ſacri imperii fideli nobis dilecto J. Shoeffer Calcographo Moguntino, gratiam noſtram Cæſaream et omne bonum. Cum ſicut *docti et moniti* ſumus fide *dignorum* teſtimonio, ingenioſum Calcographiæ, *authore avo tuo, inventum*, felicibus incrementis in univerſum orbem promnaverit, &c. Proinde volentes tibi, tum ob *avum* tuum, tam omni vel ob hoc divinum inventum favore et commendatione dignum, ſuccurrere, &c. . . . omnibus Calcographis inhibemus, &c. to print this work [*a*]."

Dedicatio T. Livii Germanice verſi, editique an. 1505. Imp. Maximiliano inſcripta.

" Hoc opus, quod in laudatiſſima urbe *Moguntia* exantlatum atque impreſſum eſt, Imperatoria tua majeſtas benigne recipiat, in qua etiam primum admiranda *ars typographica* ab ingenioſo Joanne Guttenbergio, ann. a nativitate Chriſti 1450, inventa; et poſthac *ſtudio, ſumtu, et labore* Johannis Fuſt, et Petri Schoefferi *Moguntia emendata* et ad poſteros propagata eſt; unde huic urbi non Germanica ſolum natio ſed omnis etiam terrarum orbis æternas laudes optimeque promeritas debet, ejuſque cives atque incolæ hoc jure legitime fruuntur [*b*]."

There appears all the candour in this account that ſhould give credit to it. The firſt invention is honeſtly aſcribed to Guttenberg. This muſt be allowed, as far as the faint attempts to diſcover the art had been made by him; but which would not have been completed without the help of Fuſt. Would Eraſmus have countenanced this bold aſſertion; would he ſuffer the emperor to credit it, or could the emperor himſelf, after conſulting ſo many *able perſons*, believe Schoeffer; if this claim, at that time, had not been generally acknowledged, and no claim from Harlem known or heard of?

[*a*] Meerman, t. II. p. 147. [*b*] Ibid. p. 145.

Ex

Ex Epiſtola Trithemii ad Jacob. Kymolanum, data 1507. Lib. II. Epiſt. 44.

" Ars, quam vocant impreſſoriam, tempore infantiæ meæ, apud *Moguntiam,* metropolim Francorum, inventa, infinita pene et veterum et novorum volumina quotidie producit in lucem [*a*]." This writer I ſhall ſoon bring forward again as the beſt, fulleſt, and moſt concluſive, authority I can produce.

Ex Chronico Sponheimenſi (ſcripta ann. 1506, et ſeq.) ad an. 1450.

" His quoque temporibus, ars imprimendi et characterizandi libros a novo reperta eſt (if this doth not refer to the *Chineſe* who have been *preſſed* into this diſpute, I confeſs I do not underſtand it) in civitate *Moguntina,* per quendam civem, qui Joannes Gutenberg dicebatur; qui cum omnem ſubſtantiam, propter nimiam difficultatem inventionis novæ, in eam perficiendam expoſuiſſet, *concilio* et auxilio bonorum virorum Joannis Fuſt et aliorum adjutus, rem inceptam perfecit. Primus autem hujus artis dilatator fuit, poſt ipſum inventorem, Petrus Opilionis de Gernſheim, qui multa volumina ſuo tempore impreſſit. Morabatur autem præfatus J. Guttenberg Moguntiæ in domo dicta *zum Jungen,* quæ *domus uſque* in præſentem diem illius novæ artis nomine *dignoſcitur* inſignita [*b*]." So we have a houſe to ſhew as well as Harlem for the invention, though not quite ſo old.

Ex Epit. rerum. Germ. cap. 65, per Joannem Wymphilingium. He was born in 1450, and lived till 1528; his authority, therefore, is conſiderable.

" Quod ergo nonnulli adſcribunt excellentiſſimæ rei inventionem civi Moguntino, et nonnulli quidem *Joan. Fuſto,* et ad annum circiter 1452, prorogant artem primùm; inde accidit quod primus inventor excogitatam a ſe artem in patria (this muſt be Guttenberg) Moguntia deſcendens, aliis etiam adjunctis, perfectiorem reddidit; quæ quidem paulatim ad eam perfectionem, quem nunc habet, producta eſt,

[*a*] Meerman, t. II. p. 127. [*b*] Ibid.

nam principio *ligneæ tabulæ* inſcripſerunt literas, quæ paginam libri complectuntur. Id quia magni ſumptus et laboris fuit excogitati ſunt *typi lignei* connexiles, ut filum, per foramina ſingulorum inducta in verſum *unum connectuit*, pluribus autem verſibus deinceps ſerie conjunctis, pagina expleta eſt: tandem excogitarunt ingenioſos artifices imaginem literæ in ferrum *incidere*, atque imprimere architypo æreo, quem vocant *matriculam*, atque in eo plurimas literas ejuſdem formæ ex *ſtanneo* fundere; porro litteræ omnes in ærea patula per *loculos* digeruntur, e quibus compoſitiones formularum literas connectantes, paginas implent, quæ concluſæ marginibus ferreis prelo ſubjiciuntur, ejuſque atramentum, aut alterius coloris pigmentum, vernice temperatum, ut tenacius hæreat, pelliceis pilis inducitur, illiſque chartæ humectatæ librario, prælo validius imprimuntur ut ſcriptum excipiant." This is the firſt mention of the wooden types.

Narratio Schoefferi de inventione Calcographiæ quam ſervavit Jo. Trithemius in annalibus Hirſaugienſibus. t. II. ad ann. 1450, p. 421.

" His temporibus in civitate Moguntina Germaniæ prope Rhenum, et non in *Italia*, ut quidam falſo ſcripſerunt, inventa et excogitata eſt ars illa mirabilis et *prius inaudita* (very ſtrong) imprimendi et characterizandi libros per *Joannem Guttenberger*, civem Moguntinum (this honour gives great weight to Schoeffer's teſtimony) qui cum omnem pene ſubſtantiam ſuam pro inventione hujus artis expoſuiſſet, et nimia difficultate laborans, jam in iſto, jam in alio deficeret, jamque prope eſſet, ut deſperatus negotium intermitteret, *conſilio* tandem et impenſis (very ſtrong) Joan. Fuſt, æque civis Moguntini, rem perfecit inceptam. In primis igitur characteribus literarum in *tabulis ligneis* per ordinem ſculptis, formiſque compoſitis vocabularium, *Catholicon* nuncupatum, impreſſerunt, ſed cum iiſdem formis nihil aliud potuerunt imprimere, eo quod cha-

characteres non fuerunt amovibiles de tabulis, ſed inſculpti, ſicut diximus (very plain). Poſt hæc inventis ſucceſſerunt ſubtiliora, inveneruntque modum fundendi formas omnium alphabeti Latini literarum, quas ipſi *matrices* nominabant, ex quibus rurſum *æneos ſive ſtanneos characteres fundebant*, ad omnem preſſuram ſufficientes, quos priùs *manibus ſculpebant*. Et revera ſicuti ante xxx ferme annos ex ore Petri Opilionis de Gernſheim, civis Moguntini, qui *gener* erat primi artis inventoris, audivi, magnam a primo inventionis ſuæ hæc ars impreſſoria habuit difficultatem. Namque impreſſuri *Bibliam* priuſquam tertium compleſſent in opere quaternionem, (N. B. A quire of four ſheets goes to the *quaternio,)* pluſquam 4000 florenorum expoſuerunt. Petrus autem memoratus Opilio, tunc famulus, poſtea *gener*, ſicut diximus, inventoris primi, Joan. Fuſt, homo ingenioſus et prudens, faciliorem modum fundendi characteres excogitavit, et artem, ut nunc eſt, complevit. Et hi tres imprimendi modum aliquandiu tenuerunt occultum, quouſque per famulos, ſine quorum miniſterio artem ipſam exercere non poterant, divulgatus fuit, in *Argentinenſes* primo, et paulatim in omnes nationes [*a*]."

This relation to Trithemius was in 1484, not 40 years after the invention.

It is from ſome part of this account, poſſibly, that Meerman grounds his notion of the *fuſo-ſculpti*; but, if he will attend to the words, he will find the letters *were caſt*, not all cut with the knife, as he contends; and not much different from what is done now, in which the letters, though *caſt* in the *matrices*, want the aſſiſtance of the knife to complete them.

This ſeems to be as plain and as full an account of the diſcovery as we can expect. Few, if any, of the diſcoveries of the ancient arts have reached us ſo well authenticated and explained. We have here the ſon-in-law of the inventor of the art, the principal *improver* of it *himſelf*, by the introduc-

[*a*] Meerman, t. II. p. 103.

tion of the *fuſile* metal types, giving this fair and modeſt account to Trithemius, *honeſtly* giving to Guttenberg the honour of the firſt invention. If his modeſty and candour led him to give up this praiſe to Guttenberg, what could induce him to withhold it from *Coſter* and *Harlem*, if he had known, (and know it he muſt,) that any ſuch claim had exiſted.

The whole diſpute, I think, might be ſettled by this ſingle teſtimony. I could have added the many colophons in the books printed by Fuſt and Schoeffer, inſiſting on this honour; but, Meerman is pleaſed to reject them for reaſons that I think his readers will not allow the force of. If their truth had been doubted, it is ſtrange that no champion for Coſter and Harlem would impeach them, till Mr. Meerman, *reſolutely*, three hundred years after the invention, had thought proper to reprobate them.

To what unpardonable lengths a party ſpirit will carry writers will be ſeen from the following authority, which ſhould *properly precede* the account by Trithemius from Schoeffer.

Carle Van Mander, nearly cotemporary with Junius, though he commemorates many artiſts of inferior fame, ſays nothing of *Coſter*, or his pretended diſcovery; but, in ſpeaking of the *mariner's compaſs*, and its wonderful utility, proceeds thus; "Que les anciens écrivains ne le ſeroient pas moins (ſurpris) quand ils verront l'art plus utile de la typographie, dont la *ville* d'*Harlem* s'arroge la premiere invention *avec aſſez de préſomption*." Theſe are his genuine words in his own edition of 1604, fol. 300; but, in a late edition of 1764, theſe offenſive words, "*avec aſſez de préſomption*" are altered, *monſtrum horrendum!* into "*dont Harlem avec aſſez de fondement s' attribue l'invention :*" What a cauſe to want ſuch ſupports!

XXIII. *Ob-*